

Appl. No. **10/518,761**

Amdt. dated April. 29, 2010

Reply to Office action of Oct. 29, 2010

Summary of Interview with the Examiner.

Record is made of telephone interviews with the examiner Sheila RAO and one of the inventors John Griffiths on the 16th November 2009, 20th November 2009, and 14th January 2010. The examiner advised that she would make the record of the interview.

The applicant advised the examiner that two of the cited references, namely US 6,761,051 (Tsai, Hung-Chang) and US 2005 0048863 (Nasstrom) were both filed after the priority date of our invention and should not have been cited. The examiner advised that our reply should include our foreign priority information. Note is made here that the Office Action of 29th October 2009 did specifically acknowledged our claim for foreign priority (June 23 2002 on basis of Australian filed provisional application PS 3093 and PCT AU2003 000769 based on the provisional application). The Office Action also stated that all certified copies of priority documents had been received. It remains unclear why TSAI and NASSTROM were cited.

The applicant further advised the examiner that patents have been granted in Australia and the UK for national applications in those jurisdictions based on said PCT AU2003 000769.

In response to the examiner's comments in the office action that the listing of references in the specification was not a proper disclosure statement, the applicant stated that it was his understanding that as the USPTO had received a copy of the International Search Report and related documents that it was not necessary to provide an Information Disclosure Statement for this prior art. In the absence of any other cited documents an IDS was not filed. The examiner agreed that she believed the applicant was correct, however that it may be better to file an IDS to be safe (this is being attended to imminently)